



This document includes Section 11.0, UTB 41 Class: Vessels with Compression Ignition Engines and Less than 65 Feet in Length, Small Boats, and Service Vessels, of the Draft EPA Report "Surface Vessel Bilgewater/Oil Water Separator Environmental Effects Analysis Report" published in 2003. The reference number is:
EPA-842-D-06-018

DRAFT
Environmental Effects Analysis Report
Surface Vessel Bilgewater/Oil Water
Separator

Section 11.0 – UTB 41 Class: Vessels with Compression Ignition Engines and Less than 65 Feet in Length, Small Boats, and Service Vessels

2003

SECTION 11.0 – UTB 41 CLASS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

11.0 UTB 41 CLASS 1

11.1 INTRODUCTION 1

11.2 DIFFERENCES FROM THE EEA METHODOLOGY 1

11.3 SUMMARY OF EEA RESULTS 1

11.4 MPCD RANKING AND ASSOCIATED UNCERTAINTY 2

11.0 UTB 41 CLASS

11.1 INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Effects Analysis Report (EEAR) presents surface vessel bilgewater discharge from the Uniform National Discharge Standards (UNDS) vessel group, “Compression Ignition Powered Vessels less than 65 feet in Length.” This group is composed of approximately 1,600 vessels distributed across approximately 150 vessel classes, including patrol craft, landing craft, rigid inflatable boats, buoy tenders, harbor tugs, non-standard boats, and utility boats. The Coast Guard 41-ft utility boat class (UTB 41) was selected as the representative vessel class for the group. This vessel class has 152 boats, the highest number of any class within the group, and accounts for approximately 10 percent of the total number of boats in the group. For more information about the vessel group and the selection of the representative vessel class used in this environmental effects analysis (EEA), see *Vessel Grouping and Representative Vessel Class Selection for Surface Vessel Bilgewater/Oil-Water Separator Discharge* (Navy and EPA, 2001g).

Vessels in this group receive fluids in the bilge from condensation that forms on the interior hull, from leaking propeller shafts, pump packing glands, piping, valves, and flanges. This fluid may be contaminated with oily substances used to power and lubricate the propulsion and auxiliary engines.

11.2 DIFFERENCES FROM THE EEA METHODOLOGY

The analysis of discharge information and the presentation of results in this report do not follow the methodology contained in *Environmental Effects Analysis Guidance for Phase II of the Uniform National Discharge Standards for Vessels of the Armed Forces* (Navy and EPA, 2000b). The rationale for deviating from the established methodology is described below.

As determined in the Bilgewater FIAR (Navy and EPA, 2002b), the CHT option is a feasible marine pollution control device (MPCD) for this vessel group (CHT is currently in use for this vessel group). Application of this MPCD option involves shoreside treatment of collected bilgewater at a properly permitted facility, and thus results in no discharge of untreated bilgewater to the receiving waters. When this report was written, EPA and DoD anticipated that the level of analysis in this report would be sufficient to support choosing an appropriate MPCD performance standard for the UTB 41 vessel group because CHT is expected to be the preferred option when applying the seven considerations under the Section 312(n) of the Clean Water Act (Navy and EPA, 2002b).

11.3 SUMMARY OF EEA RESULTS

There are only minimal anticipated impacts to receiving waters if CHT is conducted appropriately. There will be no toxic constituents, conditions related to narrative water quality criteria (e.g., turbid water), non-indigenous species, or bioaccumulative contaminants of concern introduced directly to the receiving water. The only potential impact to the environment identified for this MPCD would result from the discharge of treated bilgewater to a properly permitted facility.

11.4 MPCD RANKING AND ASSOCIATED UNCERTAINTY

CHT is the preferred option for this vessel group because it is assumed to have the least environmental impact when compared to the other MPCD options. There may be uncertainty in this limited analysis in regard to how much, if any, bilgewater is mishandled during transfer. However, because process knowledge of pierside management indicates mishandling is not a common occurrence, a determination of the frequency of this occurrence and associated uncertainty was not performed. Regardless of this minor aspect of uncertainty, CHT is the preferred option due to its minimal impact on the environment.